

16391.

A  
DECLARATION  
AND  
PLAINER OPENING  
OF  
CERTAIN POINTS,  
WITH  
A SOVND CONFIRMATION  
OF SOME OTHER,  
CONTAINED IN A TREATISE  
INTITVLED,  
THE DIVINE BEGINNING  
*and institution of Christes true visible  
and manifiestall Church.*

Written in a Letter by the Author of the  
said Treatise, out of the Low Coun-  
tries, to a friend of his in England.



PRINTED  
ANNO DOM. 1612.

DECLARATION

AND

PEWEE OPENING

CERTAIN POINTS

WITH

A SECOND CONFIRMATION

OF THE OTHER

CONTAINED IN A TREATISE

INTRODUCED,

THE DANCE BEGINNING

AND ENDING WITH

THE DANCE

WATERGATE, BY THE AUTHOR OF

THE TREATISE, &c. &c. &c.

IN TWO VOLUMES



PRINTED

ANNO DOM. 1788

**A Declaration & plainer opening of certaine pointes,  
with a sound Confirmation of some  
other, contained in a treatise intituled,**

*The Divine beginning and institution  
of Christes true visible  
and Ministeriall  
Church.*

Written in a letter by the Author  
of the said Treatise out of the low  
Countreys to a friend of his  
in England.

The Letter is as followeth.

**M**Y deare and loving friend, as  
by your selfe, so by sundry other  
meanes besides I have ben certified,  
that diuers pointes & passages of my late Treatise intituled,  
The Divine beginning and institution of  
Christes true Visible and Ministeriall  
Church, are doubtfully taken, that is, some  
of them are not well conceaved, some misli-  
ked, by diuers godly, wise, & well affected  
in England. Which thing verily could not

but be exceeding grievous unto me so soone  
 as it came unto my bearing. And it mooved  
 me forth-with seriously to bethinke my  
 selfe how I might best doe, both to remoove  
 the offence taken, and to cleare the truth  
 contained in that Treatise from all preiudice  
 and misconceit against it. For it being  
 the duty of all modest and sincere hearted  
 Christians, when any offence ariseth, to labour  
 that no persons who soever should bee  
 let alone in scandall and neglected, if there  
 may be remedy; how much rather ought I  
 in conscience to reach out my hand to the  
 godly and religious seruantes of Christ,  
 stumbling at something (as they thinke) by  
 my selfe laid in the way, that they may bee  
 holpen and held vp from falling, which often  
 happeneth to many upon too light occasions.  
 Although therefore it bee little materiall  
 what I write or speake, what I hold,  
 or doe not holde: yet because even on so  
 light an occasion as now is take, sometimes  
 there may come sundry accidents which I  
 would bee sorry for, if they should come by  
 my fault: for this cause I iudged it fit to  
 imploy my second thoughts upon this busi-  
 nes againe, for the clearing and plainer o-  
 pening and also for the sound confirming  
 of diuers things in my said Treatise, which



as I beare have bene even by good men excepted against. Being desirous herein to make manifest to all the world my great affection which I beare to give content to every honest and well disposed person, so farre as possibly I may or can with safetie unto the truth, which of all things in this earth is, and ought to be unto all men the most precious. What points therefore of exception have come to my notice, and are in any sort materiall, I have remembered beere in this letter unto you, and to each of them severally have adioyned an answer so plaine and so direct, and where need is, so firme, as I can make. Wherewith my desire is (and I hope I shall not faile) to satisfy every indifferent and equally minded Christian, especially who knoweth the corruptions that are among vs, & who loveth the simplicitie of the truth, & not cōtention.

**F**IRST therefore, whereas some have an imagination that I am one of the Separation, & am separated from all communion with the publike Congregations of England. To them my answer is, that touching this point they erre in their imagination. Although I know the Separation to be very farre off from being so evil as commonly they are held to be,

yet I deny not but that in some matters they are straiter then I wish they were. Howsoever, as to the point of Separation, for my part I never was, nor am separated from all publike communion with the Cōgregations of England. I acknowledge therefore that in England are true Visible Churches and Ministers (though accidentally, yet) such as I refuse not to communicate with. And so much for answer to this point shall suffice.

2. Secondly, in the Treatise a doubt is made by some, what the meaning and intent is of the maine Proposition it selfe.

The wordes whereof are these, to wit,

*“Christ is the onely author, institutor, and fram-  
mer of his Visible and Ministeriall Church touch-  
ing the Nature and Forme thereof.”*

“Treat. pag.  
1.”

1. My answer heereunto standeth on 4. pointes. First, that the Proposition it selfe in the generalitie of it (as the words ly) is true both of the Iewes Visible Church vnder the Lawe, and also of the Christian Church vnder the Gospell. Secondly, yet never-

2. theles the proper meaning and intent of this proposition (as I apply it) is to signifie no more but Christes Visible Church vnder the Gospell, and that indefinitely and generally. I meane that Christ is, & ought to be beleevved to be the only Institutor of his true Visible Churches Nature and Forme vnder the Gospell, whether it be of this or of that, or whatsoever

par-

7.  
particular forme it be off; & that it ought  
to be beleev'd to be of some certain par-  
ticular forme. The wordes them selves  
of the Proposition do import the large-  
nes of this sense; reason also requireth  
such generalitie in every Proposition  
where the wordes and circumstances will  
permit it, and the 31. Arguments (annex-  
ed for proofes) do serve therevnto direct-  
lie. Thirdly, in speciall sort in the third  
and nienth Arguments, I proove that  
Christ is the only institutor of his true  
Visible Churches nature and forme vn-  
der the Gospell definitely and determi-  
nately, that is in that very particular  
forme which the *Definition* there noteth,  
and is set downe further in the second  
*Explanation* there ensuing. That is, that  
*such a Church is only one ordinarie Congregation  
govern'd with the peoples free consent.* Where I  
graunt also that secundarilie, and by con-  
sequence from the said 3. and 9. Argu-  
ments, I intend to proove that point also  
in the rest of the 31. Arguments, even  
this very particular forme (beere last  
mentioned) of Christs visible Church.  
And I affirme that by consequence they  
all doe sufficiently conclude the same.  
But it is only by consequence, as I said:  
it is not contained immediatly, expressly,  
or literally in those Arguments them sel-  
ves. Fourthly, whatsoever other conse-  
quentes also do followe from the fore-  
noted

3.

4.

noted pointes (wherein the maine Propositions intent and meaning is now by me declared) I deny not but this said Proposition doth include and import the same. Provided alwayes that these Consequents be necessarie, and such as do follow from the former pointes inevitably. Which I am carefull to observe and note in this place, that the Reader may discern and consider what that is which this Treatise doth mainly and principally defend, and what is only a dependant on it, and a consequent therefrom. Which in equitie is not of any person either violently to be strayned, nor curiously to be wrong and wrested. But rather we ought to thinke of the maine matter, and remember who saith, "Heaven and earth shall passe away, but no part of Christes word shall fail, nor alter. Also, *The Scripture cannot be broke,* & namely, not in those places alleadged in the Treatise plentifully, wher this Kingly office & right of Christ is taught vs.

Besides this, Exception is taken at that a little after, where I set downe, that "*a Visible and Ministeriall Church is a compaine of people assembling for the exercise of religion, and administering among themselves the holy things of God, and particularly the whole Ecclesiasticall government, as occasion requireth.* There may be a Church (some say) which administred not the whole Ecclesiasticall government. I answered: In this place my pur-

" Luc 21. 33.

† Ioh 10. 35.

3.  
" Treat. pag.  
1. 1.

purpose was only to distinguish between  
 2 Church *Invisible*, and *Visible* whiche I  
 call likewise *Ministeriall*: and may also in  
 another terms very fitly bee called a  
 Church \* *Politicall*, that is indued with  
 power of outward administratiō, though  
 spirituall. My purpose heere was not to  
 set downe any further exact description  
 of a Visible Church about their admini-  
 string the whole governement. Howbe-  
 it touching this point also, I say, there is  
 no Visible, Ministeriall, or Politicall  
 Church, if it bee of Christ, but it hath  
 power and right from him to administer  
 even the whole Ecclesiasticall governe-  
 ment, as well as any part. What Church  
 soever hath right to one part of the Ec-  
 clesiasticall governement, the same cer-  
 tainly hath power & right to the whole.  
 Nevertheles I doubt not, a true Church  
 may be abridged in the actuall execution  
 of the government, as also of some other  
 of Gods ordinances; but not in the right  
 and power to execute the wholly. Which  
 still sufficeth to the being of a true Visi-  
 ble Church, and is convertible with it, as  
 the Scholes doe speak. So this surely was  
 the very intent & meaning of this word  
 in this place, *the whole* Ecclesiasticall go-  
 vernement: which, I hope, no man can  
 iustly finde fault with.

Againe, exception is taken against this  
 that I say, "*Christes true Ministers all Church is*" 4.  
*such* "Tron. p. 2."

A Church  
 Visible, Mini-  
 steriall, and  
 Politicall. I  
 vnderstand to  
 be all one,

\* Ephe. 3. 12.

*The Affertion.*

*such as hath power over persons not of many ordinarie Congregations, but of one ordinarie Congregation only.* Indeed heere I professe that Christes true Ministeriall or Visible Church is but one ordinarie Congregation only, or consisteth of people belonging to no moe ordinarie Congregations but one only: and therefore that Christs true Ministeriall or Visible Church is not any Diocesan or Provinciaall Church.

Where my meaning is not, that all Christes true Visible Churches evermore containe (each of them) no moe people then do make only one Congregation. But I meane, that none consisteth of many ordinarie and constantly set Cōgregations: every one hath but one such Congregation only, although occasionally a Church may have in it many vncertain & chāgeable Meetings.

And so the point assuredly is most evident and plaine in the whole New Testament. The prooffe whereof is easie, short, and fully sufficient. Namely thus: *In Christes and the Apostles institution and practise, all Ministeriall Churches were but one ordinarie Congregation onely. Therefore it followeth necessarily that all Christes true Ministeriall Churches were still and for ever are so, and must bee so: that is, each of them consisteth, and ought to consist of people belonging to no moe ordinarie Congregations, but to one*

*A prooffe of the foresaid Affertion.*

one onely.

And first for this Consequence, verily it is so cleare & inevitable, that nothing can be more. Namelie, if Christ and his Apostles in their institution and practise left no Diocesan or Provinciall Church, but such as were each of them one ordinarie Congregation onely, then now still and for ever all Christes true Ministeriall Churches are each of them but one ordinarie Congregation only. This doubtles can not be denied. For it is vnlawfull to holde any forme of a Church now which was not then, or hath no patterne for it vnder the Apostles. The whole scope of the maine Treatise, & the 31. Arguments therein contained doe proove so much: which also I have shewed before in this *Declaration*, viz. in my answer to the second doubt, in the "second, third, and fourth point of the answer. " pag 6.7.

The Consequence proved.

If any reply, that to be but one ordinarie Congregation, or many, is no Substantiall or Essentiall difference in a Visible Church. And then this is a changeable condition therein, and may bee altered by the discretion of men, according to the diversities of times and places; and so a Visible and Ministerial Church may yet bee all one in nature and substance still, though that which was of olde but one ordinarie Congregation, bee now a Diocesan or Provinciall Church. Heere I denie

Object.

Answer.

denie the first part of this obiection. It is a Substantiall difference in a Visible Church to be but one ordinarie Congregation, or many. Wherefore also it is evident that the Consequence of this obiection is naught. And note, that this obiection is the chiefest ground of all the error in our question about the being or not being of a true Visible, Ministeriall, and Politicall Church. Remember likewise, that still we vnderstand a Church Visible, Ministeriall, and Politicall to be all one, as I observed before in the "Answer to the third Exception. I say then, that to be but one ordinarie Congregation only, & to be Diocesan or Provinciall, is a verie substantiall and essentiall difference in a Visible Church, or at least these divers estates are inseparably ioyned to the essentiall differences of Visible and Politicall Churches, which in effect is all one.

"pag. 9.

A Substantiall  
difference in  
Visible Churches.

Reason 1.

But this needeth good prooffe for it.  
 Wherefore I make it manifest thus. That  
 Body politike which admitteth not the  
 peoples free consent in their ordinarie  
 government, differeth by a substantiall  
 and essentiall difference from a Body  
 politike which admitteth the same freedom.

A Visible Church Diocesan, or Provinciall, or larger, is a Body politike, that admitteth not the peoples free consent in their ordinarie government; a Church which



which is but one ordinarie Cōgregation, »  
is a Body politike that admitteth this »  
freedome, and can admit it well.

Therefore a Diocesan and Provinciall »  
Church, & larger, differeth by a Substan- »  
tiall and Essentiall difference from a »  
Church which is but one ordinarie Con- »  
gregation.

The first Proposition is acknowledged  
of all men of vnderstanding, generallie to  
be true. Yet the truth thereof is most e-  
vident in the spirituall (that is the Eccle-  
siasticall) government, to which intent  
it is heere chiefly applied. It is also plain-  
lie shewed in the second *Explanation*, pag.  
3. 4. 5. of the Treatise. And againe, I shall  
somewhat further declare it in my An-  
swer following to the 5. Exception.

The second Proposition or *Minor* is ac-  
knowledged also even of our adversaries:  
indeed it cannot bee denied of anie. For  
Diocesan and Provinciall Churches have  
never admitted, nor doe admit the peo-  
ples free consent in their ordinarie go-  
vernment, neither indeed can they ad-  
mit it orderly. It would be in them to  
troublesome, confused, and impossible.

Yea, where each ordinary Congregation  
giveth their free consent in their own  
gouvernement, there certainly each Con-  
gregation is an intire and independent  
Body politike, and indued with power  
immediatly vnder, and from Christ, as e-

very

very proper Church is, and ought to be. And so then there can not be any proper Diocesan or Provinciaall Church, where such Congregations be; though perhaps there may be somewhere at somtimes such names vsed (even of Diocesan and Provinciaall Churches) for other respects.

Wherefore this very one thing, namelie this freedome of the Christian people orderly & religiously practised in a church, maketh that the said Church of necessity must consist of persons belonging not to many ordinarie Congregations, and those meeting in farre remote places (as the state is of Diocesan and Provinciaall Churches) but of persons belonging to one only ordinarie Congregation. And that such were in the New Testament, & since, and are now also in these dayes, it is more then manifest. Wherefore thus the conclusion is most certaine, that a Diocesan and Provinciaall Church differeth by a Substantiall and Essentiall difference, from a Visible Church which is but one ordinarie Congregation only.

2. Another prooffe heereof is this: That
  - „ Church which out of the very Nature &
  - „ Forme of the constitution thereof, maketh
  - „ Pluralitie-Men and Nonresidentes
  - „ lawfull & good Ministers of the Gospell,
  - „ yea which hath her chiefe and principall
  - „ Ministers such, the same differeth by a
  - „ Substantiall difference from that Church
  - where-

where no Minister can be so.

The Diocesan Church, and Provincial, and larger, are Churches of that Nature. The chief and principall Pastors in these, have charge of soules of many ordinarie Congregations: also in such wise as that they neither doe, nor can yeeld their ordinarie personall presence to their people. And these surely are Pluralitie-men, and Nonresidents, in the time of the Gospel. Contrariwise, that Church which is onely one ordinarie Congregation, can not have any such Ministers.

Therefore the Diocesan Church, the Provinciall, and larger, doe differ by a Substantiall difference from that Church which is but one only ordinarie Congregation.

Thirdly, this is another reason for it. Where all proper Pastors and Bishops, and their Churches do injoye ( as the Apostles did among them selves ) *pari confortio & honore & potestate*, even all one and the same honor and power, and where likewise none doth exercise authoritie over other, nor dominion over the Lords inheritance, there is a Substantiall difference from those Churches where it is otherwise.

In the Churches which are each but one ordinarie Congregation, this equall honor and power is injoyed, and no Pastors do exercise authoritie over others, nor

Cyp. de v. back.

nor dominion over the Lordes inheritance: but in Provinciaall and Dioceſan Churches it is otherwiſe. As experience ſheweth.

Therefore in Churches which are each but one ordinarie Congregation, there is a Subſtantiall difference from Provinciaall and Dioceſan Churches.

4. Fourthly thus: In thoſe Churches where everie Paſtor doth ~~remember~~ that is, Teach and Governe, exerciſing both the Keyes, and delivering wholly the Lords appointed portiō of ſpiritual nourishment to his houſhold, there is a Subſtantiall difference from thoſe Churches where the moſt of the Paſtors doe not ſo, nor many doe ſo; but doe ſeparate that which God hath ioyned together.

In the Churches which are each of the but one ordinarie Congregation, everie Paſtor doeth ~~remember~~ that is, Teach and Governe, exerciſing both the Keyes, and delivering wholly the Lords appointed portion of Spirituall nourishment to his houſhold: in the Provinciaall and Dioceſan Churches the moſt of the Paſtors neither doe, nor may doe ſo. Yea not above one of 200. or one of 3000. doth ſo, or can doe ſo. Thus ¶ Separating that which God hath ioyned together.

Therefore in the Churches which are each of them but one ordinarie Congregation, there is a Subſtantiall difference from

“The 11. 38.

Act. 20. 28.

Pet. 5. 2.

1. Tim. 5. 17.

1. Theſ. 5. 12.

Mat. 18. 17. &

16. 19.

† Math. 19. 6.

from Diocesan Churches and Provinci-  
all and larger.

Fifthly, thus: That Visible and Politicall  
Church which hath her foundation in  
Christes Testament, and also hath sett  
boundes and limites there, differeth fun-  
damentally, and substantially, and Essen-  
tially from that Church, which neither  
hath set boundes and limites in Christes  
Testament, nor any foundation there.

A Church which is onely but one or-  
dinarie Congregation, hath her Founda-  
tion in Christes Testament, and also hath  
set bounds and limites there: a Diocesan  
or Provinciall Church, hath neither.

Therefore a Visible and Politicall  
Church which is only but one ordinarie  
Congregation, differeth fundamentally  
and substantially and essentially from a  
Diocesan or Provinciall Church.

The first Proposition or *Major* is certain,  
because touching *the Church*, \* *no other* Math. 16.  
18.  
*foundation can any man lay but that which is laid,*  
*which is Iesus Christ.* Also every Body poli-  
tike (namely the Spirituall) having  
bounds & limites set by God, must needs  
differ substantially from that which hath  
no set boundes at all, but is left at large to  
the will of men: Whereby it may soone  
become (as vsually it doth) to great and  
ynwielydy. Such a false foundation of  
Christes Church D. *Downname* layeth, and  
such false boundes thereof: viz. the order

“D. Down-  
ame Defens.  
Book. 1. pag.  
73. &c.

of “*the Civill state*. I have proved it at large  
in the Treatise to be so.

The *Minor* is likewise very true: viz. A  
Visible and Political Church which is on-  
ly but one ordinarie Congregation hath  
her foundation in Christes Testament. It  
hath both preceptes and patternes for it  
there, as is shewed in the *Treatise* Arg. 3. &  
9. and in *Reas. for reform.* pag. 19. 20. 21. yea  
most directly in the proofes of our *Antece-  
dent* heere presently following, pag. 20. &c.  
Again this Church hath her set boundes  
and limites in Christes Testament, seeing  
there it is (namely) *Ecclesia*, that is not  
many ordinarie set Assemblies but onely  
one. D. Downame saith, “*a Church vnder the  
Apostles was a great City and all the Country ad-  
ioyning*, as it hath ben since. But this is a no-  
torious fable. Never any in those times  
vnderstood the word *Ecclesia* to signifie  
many ordinary assemblies, yea in places  
far distāt a sunder as a Dioces is: though it  
now so signifieth, & did signifie about 300.  
yeares after Christ, whē they began som-  
time to meane thereby a Province, or a  
Diocesse. But we must rest our faith vpon  
the sincere speaking and doing of the A-  
postles, not vpon the equivocating words  
and declining actions of men, especially so  
late. Neither meane we by *boundes* and *li-  
mites* of the Visible Church any circuit of  
ground at all: and so neither the set com-  
passe of a *Parish*, as it is now reckoned with

“Ibid. pag.  
43. 43. 50. &c.

Note.

vs: but we vnderstand only that all the persons thereof belonged to one ordinary Congregation, and not to many in those times. This limit, we say, is set and determined in the word *Ecclesia*, where it noteth a political Visible Church in the New Testament. Which also in a good sense may be called a *Parish*, we graunt.

And these things verily are Substanti-  
all and Essentiall pointes in the Churches  
which are each but one ordinary Congre-  
gation, distinguishing them essentially  
from Diocesan Churches and Provincial,  
and larger: or at least they are inseparably  
ioyned to the essence of them (as before I  
said) which is all one in effect, and cometh  
to the same issue in our question as if they  
were of the very essence of them. So that  
the generall prooffe alleadged before in the  
beginning of "this Answer, viz. *In Christes*  
*and the Apostles institution and practise all Visible*  
*Churches were each of them but one ordinarie Con-*  
*gregation.*

(P. 22. 10.)

*Therefore all Christes true Churches now still and  
for ever are so, and ought to be so.*

This reason, I say, is firme and good, and  
cannot be shaken; the Consequence is vn-  
deniable. Seeing without question all  
Churches both then and now had & have  
but one only essence and forme, and con-  
stitution. Though they are many in nom-  
ber, yet all are but one in nature, and es-  
sence, and forme. Which both is manifest

in reason, and may be proved also by that generall axiome in *Eph. 4. 4. 5.* *There is one Body* (that is, one Visible and Politicall Church; seeing the generalitie of the word may extend heerevnto) *one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme.* This *Body, Faith, and Baptisme* are each of them simply one in nature; many in number.

The Antecedent pag. 10.  
proved.

Yet nevertheles this our maine reason, & Consequence, is true but vpon Supposition only, that is, if the first part therof be true; viz. If in Christes & the Apostles institution and practise all Churches then were each of them but only one ordinarie Congregation. Now this many do flatlie denie; many do greatly doubt of it; and it is the chiefeest point in all our controversie. Wherefore I will heere bring some most cleere & invincible reasons to prove it, namely, that *In Christes and the Apostles institution and practise all Churches then were each of them but only one ordinarie Congregation.* For prooffe whereof I reason, first thus.

**Prooffe. 1.**

Every Visible Church which had the peoples free consent in their ordinarie government rightly appointed, the same was only one ordinarie Congregation: it was no Provinciaall nor Diocesan Church.

All Christes true Visible Churches mentioned in the New Testamēt had the peoples free consent in their ordinarie government rightly appointed.

Therefore all Christes true Visible Churches



Churches mentioned in the New Testa-  
ment were each of them only one ordina-  
rie Congregation : none of them was any  
Provinciall, nor Diocesan Church.

The first Proposition is made manifest  
a little " before. The second or *Minor* is " Pag. 11. 14  
proved at large in the *Treatise* Arg. 3. and  
9. as also in the *Reas. for reform.* pag. 45. 46.  
47. &c. Vnto which point we have a ge-  
nerall consent of all godly learned men : a  
number of whom are remembred by Mai-  
ster *Whetenball*, in his *Discourse*: besides such  
as Maister *Cartwright* plentifully alleadgeth  
in his writings to this purpose. Brieftlie,  
the Churches abroad at this day do gene-  
rally acknowledge it, as also the Churches  
in the Primitive times did by their prac-  
tise. Where I pray let it be noted, that we  
stand strictlie vpon no other free consent  
of the people but this, that *populo inuito ni-* Beza.  
*hil obtrudatur*: Nothing may be imposed on  
the people against their will. Which Mai-  
ster *Beza* resolveth ought to bee everie  
where. *Epist.* 83. And vnder the Apostles  
he sheweth that it was so at the least. *An-*  
*notat.* in Act. 14. 23. & in 1. Tim. 5. 22.

Secondly I reason thus :

No Church in the Apostles times had a-  
nie Pastors Pluralistes and Nonresidents. "

All Provinciall and Diocesan Churches  
have some Pastors Pluralistes and Nonre-  
sidents. "

Therefore no Provinciall or Diocesan  
Chur-

Churches were in the Apostles times.

The first Proposition is generally held as a Principle of sound doctrine by al that have the feare of God, and any love of the truth in their hearts. For otherwise *Pluralistes* and *Nonresident* Pastors wilbe Apostolicall and lawfull, yea verily ordained & appointed by the Apostles. Howbeit yet iustly doth every good mā abhorre them, and worthily counterth them detestable: esteeming them (as in deed they are) cōtrarie to the rule of the Gospell, and to the salvation of mens soules. Namely in that they are true and manifest causes of ignorance in the people, and of their vnchristian dissolutnes of life. The *Minor* is to be vnderstood of a Diocesan or Provinciall Church properly so called, that is, where the people of the ordinarie Congregations have not that free cōsent in their governement which before I spake of, which is, at least, that nothing be vrged vpon thē by any *spirituall power* against their willes. Where the people of the Congregations have not this free power in themselves, but are absolutly vnder a Diocesan or Provinciall iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, there is that Diocesan or Provinciall Church which I signifie in the *Minor* proposition. All which Churches have *Bishops* correspondent & proportionable to their said iurisdiction. I say, they all have such correspondent and proportionable *Bishops*.

or

Dico virum-  
que esse pro-  
digiosum fla-  
gitum &c.  
Calv. Institut.  
4.5.7.

or els in all true reason they may & should have. Now al such proper Diocesan & Provinciall Bishops have a full Pastorall charge of soules of a great many (300. or 400. or many mo) distinct ordinarie Congregations. They them selves, and their defenders acknowledge this plainly. Also none of these doth nor can give his ordinarie personall presence to 2. or 3. of these said Congregations by any possible meanes.

D. Down. b. 2.  
pag. 67. &c.

And what els is a Nonresident and Pluralist vnder the Gospell but such a one? Again, if of necessitie every such Bishop be a Nonresident to 2. or 3. severall Congregations vnder him, then how much more is he a Nonresident & Pluralist in respect of all to which he is Pastor? Wherefore it remayneth cleere and certaine that everie Diocesan Bishop (and the Provinciall much more) can not but be in the time of the Gospell a huge Nonresident. Which also maketh the *Minor* both heere & before, pag. 15. to be true: wherevpon the conclusion followeth, viz. *No Provinciall or Diocesan Church was in the Apostles dayes.*

A third prooffe is this.

Where no Churches are superior to other in power: also where no Pastors do exercise authoritie over other, nor domination over the Lords inheritance, there are no Provinciall nor Diocesan Churches.

3.

In all the New Testament there are no such

such Churches, nor such Pastors.

- ” Therefore in all the New Testament  
 ” there are no Provinciaall nor Diocesan  
 ” Churches: but consequently, all are Ordinarie Congregations only.

The *Major* proposition is knowen by experience, and is without all questions. The *Minor* is as cleere in the text as any thing can be. For no where can any such Superioritie & Dominion in spiritual affayres bee found throughout the whole New Testament. Besides, the same is found expressly forbidden in Luc. 22. 26. and 1<sup>st</sup> Pet. 5. 3. There was not any firme Diocesan authoritie till the *Councill of Nice*, then it began first to be appointed by “ Law.

“ Nic. Concil.  
 Can. 6.

Before I grant there was an *old custome* of respecting the Metropolitā Bishops mind in the Churches affayres of meaner places, specially in *Egypt*: but it was by a free and voluntary affection and inclining heereunto, it was arbitrarie, it was without power, it imported no necessitie of obedience till this time of the *Nicen* Councill. So that then I grant a kinde of Diocesan Church began about 330. yeares after Christ. Howbeit yet this was farre from making a Diocesan or Provinciaall proper and persite Church whereof heere wee speake. Which indeed so long as the Christian people in the Cōgregations retained their freedom to consent in their ordinarie government, had no place in the world.

world. Now, restraint heereof tooke not place till after the 4. Council of *Carthage*: for then the people<sup>cc</sup> had this their libertie, about the yeare 420. yea (as wee may iudge) till the great Council in *Trullo*, which <sup>cc</sup> confirmed the forenamed Council of *Carthage*, about the yeare 682. So long therefore and longer wee may well thinke, this proper Diocesan Church was not erected, at least not generally; but the ordinarie Congregations were the proper Churches yet still. Of this more els where. Nevertheles by this we see that our *Minor* is certain. <sup>cc</sup> *Can. 31.* <sup>cc</sup> *Can. 2.*

A fourth prooffe is this. <sup>4.</sup>

Where all Pastors do *permanere*, that is, Teach and Rule, and where all Churches do exercise both the Keyes, and do wholly deliver the Lords appointed portiō of spirituall nourishment to his houlbould, there is no Provinciall nor Diocesan Church. In the whole New Testament all Pastors, and all Churches do so. <sup>cc</sup>

Therefore in the whole New Testament there is no Provinciall nor Diocesan Church. <sup>cc</sup>

This *Major* is likewise evident in reason and experience, as the last before was. The *Minor* is cleere by these texts, Act. 20. 18. and 1. Pet. 5. 2. and 1. Tim. 5. 17. and 1. Thes. 5. 12. Math. 18. 17. and 16. 19. Luc. 12. 42. vnto which all other are conformable and correspondent. If any sticke at

*Math.*

*Math. 18. 17.* (as perhaps some will) I re-  
ferre him for satisfaction therein to the  
Treatise it selfe, Arg. 3.

5.

Fiftly thus I prove it.

” If the most flourishing Church of *Corinth*  
” in the Apostles times was in the whole  
” but onely one ordinarie Congregation,  
” then all other Churches at that time, and  
” since, are each of them but only one or-  
dinarie Congregation.

” The most flourishing Church of *Corinth*  
” in the Apostles times was in the whole  
” but only one ordinarie Cōgregation. For  
so the Apostle saith of it, 1. Cor. 14. 23.  
*When the whole Church is come together in one,*  
*or into one place, &c.* The whole then made  
but one Congregation. The like we may  
note, Chap. 11. 20. 18. chap. 5. 4.

” Therefore all other Churches then in the  
” Apostles times and since, are each of them  
” but only one ordinarie Congregation.

The *Minor* is certain, because all true  
Churches of Christ both then, and for e-  
ver, had and haue but one forme, nature,

“ Pag. 19. 30.

† D. Down.  
Book. 2. pag.  
42-45.

and constitution, as is “ before shewed,  
and our adversaries do t graunt. To the  
*Minor*, it is idle to say (as some do) that  
those wordes, *the whole Church came toge-*  
*ther into one place*, are to be vnderstoode di-  
stributively of many severall ordinarie  
Congregations then belonging to the  
Church of *Corinth*. Nay; evidently these  
wordes are spoken touching all, and to al  
them

them, to whom the Epistle is directed, & also in that very maner. But the Epistle is directed *to the Church of Corinth* in generall collectively, 1. Cor. 1. 2. Therefore those wordes are spoken to the whole *Corinthian* Church in generall collectively; & collectively the whole in generall did *come together in one place* at that time. Besides, our adversaries say that the division of Parishes and Dioceses "came in about the yeare of Christ 260. So that then in the Apostles dayes neither the *Corinthian* Church, nor any other, was a Diocesan Church. Some further object 2. Cor. 1. 1. *To the Church at Corinth with all the Saints which are in Achaia.* As if here all the Saints which were in all *Achaia* made then but one Visible Church with that *at Corinth*; and so the *Corinthian* Church then was a Diocesan or Provinciaall Church. But there is no shew of reason in the world for this. As well may they conclude from 1. Cor. 1. 2. *To the Church at Corinth Saints by calling, with all that call vpon the name of our Lord Iesus Christ in every place, both their Lord and ours.* As well, I say, they may fro hence conclude, that *all who called vpon the name of Christ in every place* then made but one Visible Church with that *at Corinth*, and so the *Corinthian* Church then was a Vniversall Visible Church. Which how absurd it is, all men see. Yet this is altogether as good, & as likely a collectiō, as the other.

My

"Platina in  
P. Dionys.

My sixth reason is this.

6. If the Apostles, where they speake of  
 „ Christians set in outward order through  
 „ a Province, do never mention any one ge-  
 „ nerall Church of that Province, or of a  
 „ Diocese, but alwayes many severall Churches, such as were each of them one ordi-  
 „ narie Congregation only, then in the A-  
 „ postles times there was no Provinciaall or  
 „ Diocesan Church, but only such as were  
 „ each of them one ordinary Congregation  
 „ only. This sentence can not be denied or  
 „ doubted of: Seeing it is both presumptuous & absurd to hold that there was such  
 „ a forme of a Church then as cannot be gathered out of any of their writings.  
 „ Againe, it is no lesse absurd, yea impious  
 „ to hold any such forme of a Church now  
 „ as was not then, or hath no patterne for  
 „ it vnder the Apostles. But indeede al that  
 „ former clause is most true: Where the  
 „ Apostles speake of Christians set in out-  
 „ ward Order through a Province, greater  
 „ or lesser, they never mention any one ge-  
 „ nerall Church of the Province, but al-  
 „ wayes many severall Churches. As is to  
 „ be seene by their naming plurally *“the  
 „ Churches of Galatia”*: never one singular  
 „ Church of Galatia. Likewise plurally *“the  
 „ Churches of Iudea”*: & *“of Macedonia: & of Asia,  
 „ &c.* Never finde we one Church general in  
 „ any of these Provinces: neither can the like  
 „ be found any where in all the New Testam.

More-

*1<sup>st</sup> Cor. 16. 1*

*Gal. 1. 2. & 21*

*“Vers. 21. &*

*1. Thes 2. 14.*

*“ 2. Cor. 8. 1*

*¶ 1. Cor. 16.*

*19.*



Moreover the several Churches thus plu-  
rally named, are such as were each of  
them singularly one ordinary Congrega-  
tion only. The word it self importeth it. † Ecclesi.

Therefore then in the Apostles times  
there was no Provinciaall or Diocesan  
Church, but onely such as were each of  
them one ordinarie Congregation only.  
And so D. Downhames dissolute ground of a  
Church, viz. that it may follow the order  
of the civil State is heereby also quite over-  
throwne.

Against the Minor they object, that there  
was a generall Church of Crete, whereof  
Titus was Bishop. I answer, the New Te-  
stament no where nameth one generall  
Church of Crete, nor Titus Bishop of Crete.

Therefore heere is nothing against vs.  
Eusebius speaking of these times, "nameth  
the Churches of Crete plurally. Neither could  
Titus be any proper Bishop of Crete, for he  
was in the same Function and Office of  
Ministerie before he came to Crete, as he  
was when (for a time) he taried there. But  
before, being at " Jerusalem, at " Corinth, in  
" Macedonia, he was the no proper Bishop:  
he was an Evangelist. Therefore hee was  
so in Crete also. Again he was as Timothee  
was. But the Apostle saith, he was " an E-  
" Evangelist: neither is there any reason that  
the Apostle here spake improperly. There-  
fore Timothee and Titus both were Evange-  
listes: and by consequence not proper Bi-  
shops.

D Down b.  
4. pag 87.

" Euseb. 3. 4.  
and 4. 22.

" Gal. 2. 7.  
" 2. Cor. 8. 17.  
† 2. Cor. 12.  
18 with 9. 2. 3

" 2. Tim. 4. 5.

1. Cor. 13.  
28.  
Eph. 4. 11.

" D. Down.  
b. 2. pag 104.  
Rom. 16. 1.

" Act. 21. 20.  
† D. Down.  
b. 2 pag 91.

shops. The workes of Bishops they did, & more too; as also the Apostles did. Who yet were no proper Bishops, neither could be: seeing the H. Ghost had made them " divers. Also the Bishoplike power which these all had, was in them materially, not formally, as I may so speake. And it is still to remaine with their Successors, not in the forme of their proper functions, viz. as they were Apostles or Evangelistes, but in an other forme, viz. in the ordinary Bishops and Pastors, who all indeed do equally succeed them. And thus any thing that is objected of worth concerning *Titus* or *Crete*, is cleerely refuted. Further it is " objected, that *\* the Church of Cenchrea was a Parish subordnat to the Church of Corinth.* But this is easily proved to be false. *Paul* calleth it *a Church* properly: he speaketh heere questionles properly, and not by the figure *Synecdoche*, as signifying a part of a church, & not a whole Church. There is no cause of *Paul*'s figurative speaking in this place: Therefore he did not so speake. But certainly he calleth this Church of *Cenchrea* by this name as properly, as he nameth the Church of *Corinth*, or *Ephesus*, or *Antioch*. And therefore certainly it was then as proper a Church, as intire, as totall, and independent, as any of them. Lastly those " *many 10. thousands* at *Ierusalem* are objected, as making that Church then not one ordinary Congrega-

gregation only, but *Provinciall* at least. I answer, these were not all of the Church of *Ierusalem*. Heere in this text there is no such thing spoken, nor meant. But the solemne feast of *Pentecost* now being at *Ierusalem*, the greatest part of these men were come vp thither out of forraigne places and farre countries, as the Law required. For these were all jews, *Zealous of the law*, as the text heere sheweth. And this multitude (it is like) were they that would come together to know the truth of Paul when they should heare that he also was come thither. These therefore were not members of *Ierusalem* Church, though they were so many in that Citie at this time: neither doth this shew any thing of the greatnes or smallnes of the ordinarie Church at *Ierusalem* in those times, vnles it prove the same then to be, no more then one Congregation, seeing heere it is said of the whole multitude, that they would come together. Lastly thus I reason further: Every company of people ioyned together in a politic and signified by the *Greeke* word *Ecclesia* in the Apostles dayes, is but one ordinarie Congregation only.

All Christes true Visible Churches in the New Testam. are each of them a companie of people ioyned together in a politic and signified by the *Greeke* worde *Ecclesia* in the Apostles dayes.

There-

Act. 20. 16.

† Act. 21. 20.

Act. 22.

7.

”  
”  
”

”  
”  
”  
”

„ Therefore all Christes true Visible  
 „ churches in the New Testament are each  
 „ of them but one ordinarie Congregation  
 only.

Every part of this reason is most manifestly true and certain.

ee D. Down.  
 b. 2. pag. 49.  
 34. 55. 65.  
 71.

• Ecclesia,

Zuingl. Artic.  
 8. Explanat.

D. Downes whole resistance in his *Defence* standeth on a most frivolous & false exception against the *Major*. Saith he "*The circuit of a Church by the Apostles intention was the same before Parishes (in a Diocese) were divided, as it was afterward.* Which all, who vnderstand the propertie of the *Greeke* word, do know to bee false. For all authentike Greeke authors do shew that *Ecclesia* with them signified that which in Latin is *Concilio populi*; that is, one particular assembly of people, and in respect as they are assembled together in one place: but never in those times did it signifie a multitude dispersedly coming together in many distinct ordinarie Meetings, and in farre remote places, as *Provinciall* and *Diocesane Churches* do. Now the Apostles spake as all authentike Grecians spake, & namely as they commonly vsed to speak in those times. So that, vnles the Apostles words in their knowe proper sense, and their intention be contrarie (which to imagine is to absurd) there is no truth in the *Doctors* saying. His whole discourse beside, being fraught with disdainfull & disgracefull reproches, such as become rather

rather a persecuter, then a Christian teacher of the truth, it deserveth wholly to be neglected, & passed over with silence. But because hee cometh to him selfe to be somebody, it will not be amisse if his windy and wordy writing bee answered in a severall proper place. Which busines I commit to the providence of God. As for the point of the cōtroversie heere in hande, that which I defend in this place, is easie to be further proved and declared by other reasons also: but for this time I will rest cōtent with these Seaven before delivered, beside that which "heereto-  
 fore I have alleadged to this purpose.

" Reas. for re-  
 form. pag. 17.

30.

The substance of all this whole matter is knit vp in this one argument following.

*No Visible Church of Divine Institution in the New Testament is Provinciall or Diocesan.*

*Every true Visible Church of Christ is of Divine institution in the New Testament.*

*Therefore no true Visible Church of Christ is Provinciall or Diocesan.*

The Major is proved pag. 20. 21. &c. The Minor is proved pag. 10. 11. 12. &c. Wherefore the Conclusion remaineth sure.

Further, some thinke that I set downe a Contrarietie where I say, "the Single and Compound formes of government differ the one from the other by a Specificall or Essentiall difference: and "the one ceaseth necessarily when the other cometh in place. And yet (as they i-

62  
 " Tractat.  
 Page. 3.

" Page. 4.

7 pag. 6.

imagine) contrarie to this I say, *That the Church*  
*governement is mixt.* Howbeit nevertheless,  
 indeed these sentences do stand together  
 & agree right well. For the divers kinds  
 of governiement (as the Diocesan, and Pa-  
 rochiall, that is, of onely one ordinarie  
 Congregation; also the Monarchie, Ari-  
 stocratic, and Demotratie) may bee mixt  
*in gradu remisso* in their state remisse and a-  
 bated, but not *in intensu gradu* in their per-  
 fect state: they may coioyne in their Ac-  
 cidents, but not Essentially, or in their  
 distinct pure Essences. As the Direction of  
 a Pastor, with the assistance of the Elders,  
 and the peoples free consent in a Church  
 may concurre and stand together: thus  
 may the governement be mixed. But the  
 peoples free consent cannot admit either  
 a Diocesan nor yet Parochiall pure Mo-  
 narchie, or absolute Aristocratic, thus  
 they cannot be mixed. The one of these  
 necessarily doth cease when the other co-  
 meth in place: and these are those formes  
 of governement of which I say heere, *they*  
*differ truly the one from the other by a specificall*  
*& essential difference.* If any sticke in the Epi-  
 stle, where the Visible Churches Forme  
 is said to be "*the power of a Single and Uncom-*  
*pounded spiritual polities.* Let him consider that  
 the reference there noted expressly sen-  
 deth him to the second *Explanation* in the  
 beginning of the Treatise, where (pag. 5.)  
 it is declared that it ought to be *with the*  
*peoples*

in Epist. pag.  
 21. 22.

*peoples free consent.* Now in this the Forme is compleat and cleere. Howbeit yet wee speake not heere so exactly and curiously of the Visible Churches Forme, but that our meaning is only that it doth *convenire Subiecto omni, soli, & semper*: that it is convertible with it, and inseparable from it, and nothing els. And that this is in deed so proper to the said Church, it is proved in this same Treatise, Argu. 3. and 9. as before is noted. And in the *Reasons* for reformation, "pag. 45, 46, 47, &c. Now hence also it cometh, that where the Peoples free consent is orderly and constantlie had, there the Church can not bee but "only one ordinarie Congregation, and the government is Single, or over one Congregation only. Where the absolute government is Diocesane or larger, there that Church can not possibly be one ordinarie Congregation only, nor can vse ordinarily the Peoples free consent: but it must of necessitie be either by one person alone, or by a few choise persons absolut ynder Christ over a whole Diocese, or further. So that it is plaine enough divers wayes, that these governments are indeed (as I said) essentially distinguished: and the fore-rehearsed sentences do well stand together, and agree easily.

Moreover the first *Proposition* of the first Argumēt is thought by some to be amisse:

¶ 12, "Whatsoever [is] a Divine institution, the same

" Compared with pag. 26: 27. 28.

" As in Arg. 9. in the Treat. &c above pag. 19: 14.

6:

" Treat. pt. 9.

*same is perpetuall.* But why should any doubt of this? They say, Because the Jewes high Priesthood was a Divine institution, also the Calling of the Apostles: and yet neither is perpetuall. Wherevnto the answer is easie: viz. Neither of these cometh near the point in question. The wordes of the Proposition are, *Whatsoever is: not, Whatsoever was, or hath ben a Divine institution.* Wherefore I speake of Divine institutions and ordināces which are now such at this present time, even in our dayes: not of such as were Divine heeretofore only, that is only in the time of the Jewes estate, or of the Apostles, such as the instances are which be objected. I speake not (I say) of any Leviticall or Apostolicall temporarie ordinances. Which to be my very meaning in this place, appeareth partly in the *Minor* Proposition of the said Argument, which of necessitie must bee taken so; and more fully straight after in handling the prooffe of the said *Minor*.

7.

Treat.

Pag. 26.

Further it is excepted against, where I say, "This word *Ecclesia* or *Kahal* in Hebrew is no where found in any Author (true or other) to signifie a bench of Iusticers, or Senat of Magistrates. This cannot be shewed in any other place at all. But contrarie to this some alleadge that the *Septuagint* do translate *Kahal* in "one place *Quiriquis* a Senat. I answer, it is not materiall to our maine purpose in this place how the Hebrew *Kahal* is once by the *Sep-*



*magint* translated, though I added this word, which I needed not. For all the matter indeed standeth in the Greek word *Ecclesia*, which is the "originall text, Now " *Math. 18. 19* concerning this word, there is no exception at all taken against that which heere I alleadge. No man findeth in any author (one or other) this word *Ecclesia* to signifie a Bench of Iusticers or Senate of Magistrates: no, not once. As for that Hebrew word *Kahal* also, seeing (for ought that appeareth) it is translated *Senat* no where, but only this once: we are to suppose that thesame Authors (viz. the *Septuagint*) who translate it more then 100. times otherwise, do thinke the proper sense of this word not to be a *Senat*. And why it should not also be proper in the Hebrew translation of *Math. 18. 17.* there is no reason in the world. Againe the *Septuagint* them selves are of no good authoritie for translation. And learned men do iudge that (after the five bookes of *Moses*) the translation bearing their name, is not theirs. How so ever, they are generally knowen for translation to be most wide, strange, and vnfit. Maister *Hugh Broughton* "saith of them, that all learned men for these 1300. yeares space do know the *Septuagint* translators have infinite millions of faulces. Neither do our *Englisch* translations, nor *Tremellius*, nor *Vatablus*, nor the *Interimarie*, nor *Arias Montanus*, nor *Munster*, nor any good

D. Field. of  
the Church.

"Against Dav.  
Farrar the Jew.

¶ Vix. Neither  
French, nor  
Dutch, nor  
Spanish, nor  
Italian.

¶ Translators (as far as I know) follow the  
in this place of the *Proverbes*. So that name-  
lie here they seeme to be held of no sound  
writer, for Authors of any credit in this  
particular, howsoever they bee esteemed  
otherwise.

8.

Againe, some mislike that (in the *As-  
sumption* of Argument 7.) the Ministeriall  
Church and Church-governement are  
said to be *Fundamentall pointes of religion*, and  
*a part of the foundation of Christian faith*. But if  
men would consider things well, sure  
heere is no cause of mislike. Alwayes re-  
membring, that I do not take *the foundation  
of faith* heere in that sense as Christ him-  
selfe is held and acknowledged to bee the  
Foundation of our faith, 1. Cor. 3. 11. He  
alone is that absolute Foundation. Nei-  
ther do I take it in that sense as the word  
of God is acknowledged to be the general  
foundatiō of faith, which only togeather  
with Christ (the author of it) our faith  
can rest on. But in that sense I take it as  
the Apostle vseth it in *Hebr. 6. 1. 2.* where  
manifestly he vseth this word *Foundations*  
to signifie certaine points of religion, and  
speciall Doctrines necessary to salvation  
ordinarily, and vnchangeable by men.  
He setteth downe in this place 6. of them  
of which some are Inward, some Out-  
ward: Some requiring outward action &  
practise, some speculation and beliefe on-  
ly. Among them that require outward

action and practise, he nameth *Laying on of hands* as one part of this foundation. Now this cannot be heere vnderstood with a nic good colour, but for *Calling to the Ministerie*; as is shewed evidently in the Treatise. And Calling to the Ministerie, or the Making of Ministers is one maine part of Church-governement. And of that nature as the Church-governement is, of the same is the Visible, or Ministeriall, or Politicall Church it selfe. As also, of that nature as a maine part of Church-governement is, of the same is the whole. Wherevpon I reason thus: If "*Laying on of hands*" (which is one maine part of Church-governement, as before is shewed) be of the foundation, necessarie to salvation ordinarily, and vncchangeable by men, the Church-governement, and the Church it selfe is so. But the former is certain by the text *Heb. 6. 2.* as before I have shewed. Therefore the later is certain also, viz. the Ministeriall Church & Church-governement are of the foundation of faith, or fundamentall pointes of religion, they are necessarie to salvation ordinarily, and vncchangeable by men. Secondly, as *Baptisme* is heere called also *fundamentall*, so is this *Laying on of hands*, or Calling to the Ministerie. But heerein is meant no more (touching Baptisme) save that it is a meanes to salvation necessarie ordinarily, and simply vncchangeable by men. Wherefore

## Reason

1.

"That is, Making of Ministers ordinarily effected by Laying on of hands."

2.

3.

et Cypr. de uni-  
tat. Eccles.

even so is Calling to the Ministerie vnderstood to be, where in the Treatise it is called *Fundamentall*. Thirdly, I take it, no well advised Christian will deny Christes true Visible and Ministerial Church to be fundamentall. Of which, *Cyprian* saying is approved by all men, viz. *Deum non habet Patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem*: Hee hath not God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his mother. And likewise is that comon saying; *Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*: Out of the Church there is no salvation. Both which sayings are true of Christes Visible and Ministeriall Church: howbeit not simply, but ordinarielie. Yea they signifie also, that this ordinarie way and meanes to salvation, (viz. the Visible Church) appointed by God is vchangeable by men. This sense of *foundation* is giue to Christes true Visible Church, I suppose by all well advised Christians.

4.

Fourthly, that is a fundamentall point which toucheth Christ (the absolute foundation) in some of his maine Offices immediatly, or (at least) by a sure and plaine consequence. But Christes Visible Church and governemēt doth immediatly touch him in his *Kingly* Office and in his *Prophe-ticall* Office also. As is shewed at full in *Arg. 3.* in the Treatise; yea in every *Argument* there by a most certain Cōsequence. Most directly in the 4. 6. 10. 17. 18. 19. 23. 24. 25. 26. 28. 30. 31. And in *Reas. for reform.*

pag.

pag. 52. 53. 54. Wherefore Christes Visible Church and Governement are to bee acknowledged *fundamentall* pointes in religion. Fiftly, let vs heere consider how we do iudge of the *Papistes* touching this matter, viz. touching Fundamentall errors. We all holde (and iustly) that certain Popish errors are Fundamentall, and against every one of Christes maine Offices. Among which, their error about the Visible Church and governement thereof is against Christes Kingdome. Wherefore hence it followeth that Christes Visible Church and Governement is a fundamentall point in religion: seeing their error which they holde in that matter is a fundamentall error, as wee all acknowledge. Sixtly, the learned writers "do set downe three Essentiall (at least, perpetuall and necessarie) notes of a Visible Church, viz. *the Word, Sacraments, and Governement*. Vnderstand, that by this heere is meant *the power* to administer these things, as I have noted before pa. 7. Now if Governement thus be Essentiall to the Church, it may be also called fundamentall without question.

Where still I desire it may bee remembered, that by this our interpretation of *Laying on of handes in Hebr. 5. 2. to be fundamentall*, our whole meaning and intent is to shewe this only, that the Nature of Christes Visible Church and Governement is

Vn-

5.

6.

Beza confel

5. 7.

P. Mart. in 1.

Cor. 1. 2.

Vitæ Dial. 74.

& 31. at the end.

T. C. Reply 2.

pag. 53.

D. Field of the Church. 2. 6.

D. Down. Def.

b. 3. pag. 6.

The Confessi. of faith in the end of the book of com. prayer.

vchangeable by men: and that after the constant & perpetuall ordinance of God, Salvation through Christ cometh into vs ordinarily alwayes by meanes of the true Visible Church & Ministerie of the word therein. According to that, "*Faith is by hearing, and hearing by the preaching of Gods word by Ministers orderly sent* (that is) according to his rule. Which doctrine all sound Divines do teach in like sort.

Heerevnto I will adde Mai. Cartwrights iudgement, who maintaineth this earnestly, that "*Matters of Discipline and kinde of Government are matters necessarie to salvation, and of faith.*"

Y.C. repl. 2.  
pag. 36.

If any doubt whether I think a mā may bee saved that erreth about the Visible Churches particular forme and Government. I answere, I thinke such a man may be saved. In what regard, and how, I have formerly set downe in those *Reasons for reformation*. pag. 55.

9. Lastly, the *Argument* 16. in the Treatise is excepted against. Where indeed I deny not, but the maner of gathering that *Argument* is scarce as it should be: the Enumeration there vsed might be somewhat more full. Howbeit that text of Scripture 1. Cor. 15. 24. (which is the ground of the *Argument*) will very well yeeld the Conclusion, so that it bee gathered and framed in such maner as now heere it is set downe. Wherefore I pray the Reader to

to conceive it thus:

Where Christes whole *Oeconomicall King-*  
*dome* is signified, there also the Outward  
 Ecclesiastical administration & governe-  
 ment, or the State of the Visible Church  
 is indefinitely & generally signified. And  
 againe, it followeth from hence that also  
 there in the same text the Outward Ec-  
 clesiastical Governement and State of the  
 Visible Church vnder the Gospell in spe-  
 ciall is signified. And withall there is sig-  
 nified that this same Outward Ecclesiasti-  
 call Governement and State of the Visi-  
 ble Church vnder the Gospell is truly &  
 in deed Christes Kingdome. And like-  
 wise, that hee him selfe is the only Au-  
 thor, and Frammer, yea the only Lord,  
 King, and Law-giver thereof to the  
 worldes end. For who can be Author and  
 Law-giver of his owne kingdom but on-  
 ly him selfe?

Argu. 16. in  
the Treatise.

In 1. Cor. 15. 24. Christes whole *Oecono-*  
*micall Kingdome* is signified.

Therefore in 1. Cor. 15. 24. the Outward  
 Ecclesiastical administration & governe-  
 ment, or the State of the Visible Church  
 (yea that vnder the Gospell) is also signi-  
 fied. And againe from 1. Corinth. 15. 24. in  
 such respect it followeth necessarily, that  
 the Outward Ecclesiastical Governement  
 and State of the Visible Church vnder the  
 Gospell is truly and in deed *Christes King-*  
*dome*. And likewise, that hee him selfe is  
 the

re the only Author, and Framer, yea the on-  
 ly Lord, King, and Law-giver thereof to  
 the worldes end.

The Assumption heere is most evi-  
 dently true. Considering that by Christes  
*Oeconomicall Kingdome* we meane (and so the  
 Interpreters do call it and vnderstand it  
 to be) all that power and rule which as  
 Mediator and Head of his Church he re-  
 ceaved " of the Father, and administred  
 ever since (by him selfe and his servants)  
 till the worldes end, but no longer. This  
 sense the present text (1. Cor. 15. 24.) will  
 well beare being taken in the largest man-  
 ner that the Circumstances do admit.  
 And every text alwayes must be taken in  
 such most large sense.

The Consequence of the Proposition  
 standeth on foure partes . And I see not  
 how any one of them can possibly be de-  
 nied. If any should, it will easily be pro-  
 ved.

Thus, though our former *Argument* 16.  
 in the Treatise for the manner of gathe-  
 ring, bee not (I grant) altogether so well  
 as it should bee, yet the Text it selfe 1.  
 Cor. 15. 24. doth still affoorde a good and  
 sound Argument for our maine purpose,  
 as is said. And thus in effect heere is no-  
 thing lost. And so much for answer to  
 these 9. Exceptions.

*Hiberto*



*Hitherto (my deare and loving friend)  
I have waded labouring to give satisfacti-  
on to all good people (according as it may  
come to their notice) so farre as my con-  
science with warrant of the truth will permit.  
Humbly desiring all loving and upright  
hearted Christians to interpret this same,  
together with what soever I have heere-  
tofore written, as only and meerely the ef-  
fectes of conscience in me, agreeing (so neare  
as I could discern) to my dutie inioyned  
me in Gods word. The grace, mercy, and  
love of God in Iesus Christ be with vs all.  
Amen. Middleborough. the 4. of Sep-  
tember. Anno 1611.*

HENRY IACOB.

